



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,754	11/21/2001	Darcy J. McCulloch	049681-5003	9659
28089	7590	01/24/2005	EXAMINER	
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 399 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022			ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/989,754	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MCCULLOCH, DARCY J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Neveen Abel-Jalil	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Victor Souto & team (Attorney of Record). (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Neveen Abel-Jalil. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Musgrove et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,880 B1).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant request the After-Final interview to discuss the difference between the current application and the cited art specifically with regards to the limitation "(e) proving at least some of the transactional data to the at least two uses of the transaction" as found in claim 1.

The applicant argued that the "providing" step allows for two user (i.e. merchant and client) to have access to transactional information status basically providing a single view to the stored information. The transactional information will accurately maintained that way and both users will have the same view. The Examiner maintained that the "providing" limitation broadly interpreted to read on Musgrove column 7, lines 52-67 in stating that any transactional data can be acquired at any time by each user. The Examiner maintained the rejection.

The applicant suggested a possible amendment to the Independent claim to distinguish over prior art (Musgrove et al.)